

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 26-28 remain pending.

Upon allowance of the independent Claims 1 and 17, Applicant wishes to revive all the withdrawn Claims 7, 9, 10, 13, 14, 22, 25, 29, and 30.

The only claim element at issue is the random selection of the number of subsequent base games to which the one or more features will apply in response to a triggering event. This refers to the “power games selector 30” in Fig. 1, described on pages 4-5 of the specification. So, in Claims 1 and 17, not only is the feature randomly selected in response to the triggering event, but the number of games to which the feature is applied is randomly selected in response to the triggering event.

The examiner rejected all pending Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 15-18, 20, 21, 23, 24, and 26-28 under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Nordman (US 6,905,407) in view of the newly cited Crawford (US 6,270,412).

Nordman discloses various embodiments of bonus features that are enabled upon a triggering event. There is no suggestion at all in Nordman for the extra step of “randomly selecting a number of subsequent base games, equal to one or more, to which the one or more features will apply.” The examiner agrees that Nordman does not teach this step. Once one of the Nordman features is randomly selected, there is no further random determination.

The examiner cites Crawford for Crawford’s teaching of a player saving symbols from one base game and then applying the saved symbols to any subsequent base game to achieve a winning symbol combination.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no suggestion in Crawford of the step of “in response to the triggering event, randomly selecting a number of subsequent base games, equal to one or more, to which the one or more features will apply.” This step is completely absent in Crawford. It would make no sense for the saved symbols in Crawford to somehow be applied to a randomly selected number of games since the player is allowed to apply the

saved symbols to whatever game would give the player the highest winning combination. Once the player uses a saved symbol, that saved symbols is extinguished (col. 4, lines 43-45).

It is respectfully submitted that the examiner is trying to reject the claims when there is clearly no suggestion for the claims.

The examiner stated on page 3 of the office action,

Crawford et al., however, teaches a gaming system wherein one or more features randomly selected is saved for the next of subsequent game (see abstract). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the user a game symbol saving option, as taught by Crawford et al., to the game system of Nordman to enhance game experience, and further, allow the player to continue the game with the saved game feature to encourage the player to play the game again, thus increase casino revenue.

It is respectfully submitted that the number of games to which the Craford symbol save feature applied is not randomly selected in response to the triggering event. There is no randomness involved in the application of the symbol save feature, or the symbols that are saved, or the use of the saved symbols. Even if the Crawford symbol save feature were applied to Nordman, there would be no step of "in response to the triggering event, randomly selecting a number of subsequent base games, equal to one or more, to which the one or more features will apply."

Claims 1 and 17 have the same patentable features. Accordingly, since all claims depend on Claims 1 and 17, it is respectfully submitted that all claims are allowable.

Please telephone the undersigned at (408) 382-0480 ex. 202, if there are any questions or suggested claim amendments.

Certificate of Electronic Transmission
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being submitted electronically to the United States Patent and Trademark Office using EFS-Web on the date shown below.

/Brian D. Ogonowsky/
Attorney for Applicant(s)

February 12, 2010
Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,

/Brian D Ogonowsky/

Brian D. Ogonowsky
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 31,988

Patent Law Group LLP
2635 N. First St.
Suite 223
San Jose, CA 95134
Tel (408) 382-0480 x202
Fax (408) 382-0481